



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/876,666

06/07/2001

Motoi Sato

44471-259522 (13700)

9577

23370 7590 06/18/2007  
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP  
1100 PEACHTREE STREET  
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER

CHAMPAGNE, DONALD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/876,666

**Applicant(s)**

SATO ET AL.

**Examiner**

Donald L. Champagne

**Art Unit**

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-14 and 24-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 and 19-23 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6 February 2007 has been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15-17, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Linden et al. (US006266649B1).
5. Linden et al. teaches (independent claims 15, 22 and 23) a method, device and computer readable medium for providing an advertisement, the method comprising:  
managing records of a user's purchase history (col. 7 lines 24-33), which said records read on access logs of accesses made by users, and advertisement information of an

Art Unit: 3622

advertisement sponsor (inherently, para. 7 below) for some product "B" recommendation (col. 11 lines 54-56) which is to be provided to a client who is a user accessing target information specified in advance by the advertisement sponsor (product "A" *contents of the user's shopping cart*, col. 3 lines 38-40 and col. 4 line 66 to col. 5 line 1 and para. 8 below), where the product "B" recommendation advertisement information is associated with additional information of the advertisement sponsor (the product "B" recommended item's *product information page*, col. 11 line 52) that can be accessed by the user client from the advertisement information (col. 11 lines 50-52);

adding access logs of other purchaser users who are advertisement agent virtual users accessing both the product "A" target information and the product "B" additional information (col. 3 lines 1-3);

providing the advertisement in response to a request from the client (the client making said request implicitly by adding product "A" to his or her shopping cart, col. 10 lines 39-43), by detecting the advertisement agents as related users who made accesses to the product "A" target information besides the client according to the access logs (col. 3 lines 1-3), extracting the additional information as correlated information that is accessed by the related users according to the access logs (col. 2 line 57 to col. 3 line 1 and col. 10 lines 37-39, col. 10 line 64 to 66), and delivering the advertisement information managed in association with the additional information as extracted, to the client (col. 11 lines 38-39, 49-50 and 54-56).

6. **Interpretation of claim terms** - Unless a term is given a "clear definition" in the specification (MPEP § 2111.01), the examiner is obligated to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of the specification, and consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach (MPEP § 2111). An inventor may define specific terms used to describe invention, but must do so "with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision" (MPEP § 2111.01.III). A "clear definition" must establish the metes and bounds of the terms. A clear definition must unambiguously establish what is and what is not included. A clear definition is indicated by a section labeled definitions, or by the use of phrases such as "by xxx we mean"; "xxx is defined as"; or "xxx includes, ... but does not include ...". An example does not constitute a "clear definition" beyond the scope of the example.

Art Unit: 3622

7. The instant application contains no such clear definition for the phrase "advertisement sponsor". Hence, the examiner is required to give the term "advertisement sponsor" its broadest reasonable interpretation, which the examiner judges to be any entity that promotes a product/service, said promotion being the advertisement. The *recommendations service* taught by Linden et al. reads on an "advertisement sponsor", where the product/service *recommendation* reads on an advertisement. By definition, "advertisement information" is "of an advertisement sponsor".
8. The limitation "target information specified in advance by the advertisement sponsor" is also not clearly defined in the spec., and is interpreted as the *contents of the user's shopping cart* taught by Linden et al. The accumulation of the shopping cart data (col. 4 line 66 to col. 5 line 1) reads on "specified in advance".
9. Linden et al. also teaches at the citations given above claim 17. Linden et al. also teaches claim 16, where the periodic (e.g., *weekly*) updating of the *mappings of items to similar items* (col. 5 line 57 to col. 6 line 2) reads on detecting other related users. The continual accumulation of purchase histories reads on adding access logs of other advertisement agents.
10. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Linden et al. in view of Yonezawa et al. (US 20030191742A1). Linden et al. does not teach charging an advertisement fee for a minimum advertisement information delivery count. Yonezawa et al. teaches charging an advertisement fee for a minimum advertisement information delivery count (para. [0008]). Because Yonezawa et al. teaches that this enables better management of time-sensitive advertising (para. [0021]), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the teachings of Yonezawa et al. to those of Linden et al. Neither reference teaches (claim 21) refunding at least part of the advertisement fee. However, refunding is always an obvious alternative when contract terms cannot be met.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 6 February 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments are addressed by the revised rejection, including the addition of para. 6-8 above.

### **Conclusion**

12. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09876666. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:30 AM to 8 PM ET, Monday to Thursday. The examiner can also be contacted by e-mail at [donald.champagne@uspto.gov](mailto:donald.champagne@uspto.gov), and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717. The fax phone number for all *formal* matters is 571-273-8300.
15. The examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber, can be reached on 571-272-6724.
16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3622

17. **AFTER FINAL PRACTICE** – Consistent with MPEP § 706.07(f) and 713.09, prosecution generally ends with the final rejection. Examiner will grant an interview after final only when applicant presents compelling evidence that “disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration” (MPEP § 713.09). The burden is on applicant to demonstrate this requirement, preferably in no more than 25 words. Amendments are entered after final only when the amendments will clearly simplify issues, or put the case into condition for allowance, clearly and without additional search or more than nominal consideration.
18. Applicant may have after final arguments considered and amendments entered by filing an RCE.
19. **ABANDONMENT** – If examiner cannot by telephone verify applicant’s intent to continue prosecution, the application is subject to abandonment six months after mailing of the last Office action. The agent, attorney or applicant point of contact is responsible for assuring that the Office has their telephone number. Agents and attorneys may verify their registration information including telephone number at the Office’s web site, [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov). At the top of the home page, click on Site Index. Then click on Agent & Attorney Roster in the alphabetic list, and search for your registration by your name or number.

29 May 2007



DONALD L. CHAMPAGNE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Donald L. Champagne  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3622